

Application No.: 10/758716
Docket No.: AD6950USNA

Page 3

REMARKS

The amendment to the claim corrects an error in the claim language, wherein it can be interpreted to indicate that it is optional to use a powdered LCP. Such an interpretation was unintended and the language has now been corrected. It should now be clear that use of a powdered thermotropic LCP is not optional but, instead, a requirement. Support for the amendment can be found in the Summary of the Invention, as well as throughout the specification.

In addition, the Applicants have requested that the claim be amended to include the limitation that the melt flow of the LCP is restricted to avoid formation of an anisotropic melt. This limitation also has support in the specification, at page 6, lines 25-29.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Eckhardt et al (US Pat. No. 4,835,243). The Examiner contends that Eckhardt teaches that a isotropic part is obtained under the conditions claimed by the Applicants. The Examiner cites the Applicants' own specification as the basis for this contention, contending that compression molding is sufficient to produce an anisotropic part from a thermotropic LCP, and also stating that the Applicants' process does not limit the claims to specify restriction of melt flow.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that the use of powdered LCP is not optional. The Applicants have amended the claim so that this requirement has been clarified. Further, a condition has been stipulated in the claim whereby the flow of the melted LCP composition is restricted such that an anisotropic melt is not obtained, and a isotropic part is obtained. Because Eckhardt does not recite the conditions claimed by the Applicants, and in fact does not distinguish the result obtained by compression molding from the results obtained by injection molding or extrusion, it cannot be said that Eckhardt provides the same steps claimed by Applicants to obtain the Applicants' claimed result.

The Applicants further rely upon the arguments presented in the previous communication, and respectfully request that the rejection of the claim based on Eckhardt be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Kock, et al. (EP 0 239 036). The Examiner contends that the injection embossing process described by Kock employs a thermotropic liquid crystalline polymer such that an isotropic molded part is obtained.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The injection embossing process taught by Kock is very far from the claimed invention. The injection embossing process is a process whereby a melt is injected into a mold, rather than – as the presently claimed

Application No.: 10/758716
Docket No.: AD6950USNA

Page 4

invention requires – placing a powder composition into a mold. Further, injection embossing inherently requires flow of a melted polymer with resultant high shear, neither of which is within the scope of the claimed invention. While Kock does mention that compression molding can be used, Kock does not teach that a thermotropic polymer can be compression molded into an isotropic part. The Applicants respectfully contend that Kock does not anticipate the claimed invention.

The Applicants submit that the rejection of the Claim as anticipated by the references has been fully addressed herein, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn, and that the Claim be allowed instead.

Respectfully submitted,



KEVIN S. ROBSON
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 40,296
Telephone: (302) 892-5526
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: February 10, 2007